|  |
| --- |
| **Tables S1: Quality assessment of the included study with New Castle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale** |
| **Study** | **Represent-ativeness of exposed cohort** | **Selection of non-exposed cohort** | **Ascertain- ment of exposure** | **Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study** | **Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis** | **Assessment of outcome** | **Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur** | **Adequacy of follow up completion of cohorts** |
| Blum 2007 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Blum 2012 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Ganguly 2013 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Garcia-Manero 2006 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Halpern 2014 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Hao 2014 | \* |  | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Jiang 2015 | \* |  | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Kirschbaum 2014 | \* |  | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Liesveld 2013 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Mims 2018 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Mupiddi 2015 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Phillips 2013 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Ritchie 2013 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Schroeder 2018 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Sun 2015 | \* |  | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Welch 2014 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Willemze 1993 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Willemze 1997 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| William 2013 | \* |  | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Zhang 2016 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Zhao 2017 | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* | \* |
| Zhou 2016 | \* |  | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| **CRITERIA** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Selection** | **Comparability** | **Outcome** |
| 1) Representativeness of the exposed cohorta) truly representative of the average \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (describe) in the community **** b) somewhat representative of the average \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ in the community ****c) selected group of users e.g. nurses, volunteersd) no description of the derivation of the cohort2) Selection of the non-exposed cohorta) drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort ****b) drawn from a different sourcec) no description of the derivation of the non-exposed cohort 3) Ascertainment of exposurea) secure record (e.g. surgical records) ****b) structured interview ****c) written self-reportd) no description4) Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of studya) yes ****b) no | 1) Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysisa) study controls for \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (select the most important factor) ****b) study controls for any additional factor **** (This criterion could be modified to indicate specific control for a second important factor.)  | 1) Assessment of outcome a) independent blind assessment **** b) record linkage ****c) self-report d) no description2) Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occura) yes (select an adequate follow up period for outcome of interest) ****b) no3) Adequacy of follow up of cohortsa) complete follow up - all subjects accounted for **** b) subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias - small number lost - > \_\_\_\_ % (select an adequate %) follow up, or description provided of those lost) ****c) follow up rate < \_\_\_\_% (select an adequate %) and no description of those lostd) no statement |

Note: A study can be awarded a maximum of one star for each numbered item within the Selection and Outcome categories. A maximum of two stars can be given for Comparability